

Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the first Office Action mailed January 29, 2007. Claims 1-20 were examined. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. No claims have been amended, canceled or added. Reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 101

The Office Action rejected claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant disagrees that a broad meaning of “a computer program product” is non-statutory if it encompasses a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave. However, in order to advance prosecution of the application, paragraph [0006] has been amended to address the §101 concerns. No new matter has been added. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under §101 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0013851 to Pollack (hereinafter referred to as “Pollack”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites “A method comprising: providing a network address for a system host to a remote client if security credentials for the remote client satisfy at least one condition for accessing the system host; and verifying the

remote client is authorized to access the system host in response to a request from the system host to verify the remote client.” Claim 6 includes parallel recitations. Pollack fails to teach or suggest at least these recitations.

With respect to claims 1 and 6, the Office Action cites paragraph 0038 of Pollack, and in particular the URL mentioned towards the end of paragraph 0038, as teaching the claimed “providing a network address for a system host to a remote client if security credentials for the remote client satisfy at least one condition for accessing the system host.” However, the URL is explained in paragraph 0040 as “... not [being] a general URL to anywhere on the Internet, but a particular key to a file known only to the user.” Thus, the URL of Pollack is not “a network address for a system host.” Moreover, the URL is provided by the user as part of the user’s access request; it is not provided to a remote client after the remote client has been verified. In the system of Pollack, the user, by virtue of the e-mailed request, has already established communications with the system (although the user will not have access to the requested file until properly verified). In contrast, the remote client of present invention will not have the address of the system host until properly verified and, therefore, cannot have any communication with the system host. Consequently, Pollack fails to disclose or even suggest all of the elements of the independent claims and cannot, therefore, anticipate those claims.

With respect to the rejection of claims 2 and 7, paragraph 0040 of Pollack is said to disclose “granting the remote client a security key with the network address.” As noted in the preceding paragraph of this Response, no network address is provided to a remote client in Pollack, with or without a

security key. Rather, it is the user who provides a key to the system. Consequently, Pollack does not anticipate these claims.

With respect to the rejection of claims 5 and 10, again as noted in a prior paragraph of this Response, no network address is provided to a remote client in Pollack. Consequently, the network address cannot be received and Pollack does not anticipate these claims.

Because the rejections of claims 11-14 parallel the rejections of claims 1- 4 and 6 - 9, the remarks in the preceding paragraphs traversing those claims are equally applicable to claims 11 - 14. Additionally, claim 11 recites the interaction among three components: the claimed system (comprising authorization and verification modules), a remote client (from which an access request is received by the authorization module) and a system host (which is the component to which access is desired). In the claimed invention, the access request is transmitted not directly to the system host but to the authorization module of the “system.” In the exemplary networked computing system illustrated in FIG. 1 and described in the Specification (beginning in paragraph [0019], the “system” of claim 11 is the security host 120, separate from the “system host” 140. Thus, as noted above, the remote client is unable to even establish a communications link with the system host until the separate security host verifies that the user at the remote host is authorized to access the system host. Only then will the remote client receive the network address of the system host which will enable the remote client to establish a communications link with the system host.

Pollack does not disclose or even suggest that access verification can take place other than at the location of the requested file (i.e., the system host). And, because the user is already connected to the host, the system of Pollack does not provide to the user the network address of the system host.

With respect to claim 15, again because the user is already connected to the host, the system of Pollack does not provide to the user the network address of the system host and the address of a system host would not be stored in the database referred to in paragraph 0038.

Consequently, Pollack does not anticipate claims 1-15 and withdrawal of the §102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollack in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,457 to Hull (hereinafter referred to as "Hull"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 16-20 depend from claim 11, which is believed to be allowable. Because Pollack does not disclose or even suggest all of the elements of claim 11, the combination of Hull with Pollack would not result in the invention recited in claims 16-20. Therefore, claims 16-20 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11 and withdrawal of the §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the pending claims are believed to be allowable, the Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone if a conversation would expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dated: May 28, 2007

By: _____

Mark D. Trenner

Reg. No. 43,961

(720) 221-3708